



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/855,499	09/855,499 05/16/2001		Patrick Blanc	Q64525	9426
23373	7590	06/06/2005		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE	•		GANTT, ALAN T		
2100 PENNS SUITE 800	SYLVANIA A	VENUE, N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	ON, DC 20	037	2684		
				DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/855,499	BLANC, PATRICK		
Examiner	Art Unit .		
Alan T. Gantt	2684		

Advisory Action	DEANC, PATRICK							
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit .						
	Alan T. Gantt	2684						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
 THE REPLY FILED <u>15 April 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		•						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must t</li> </ol>	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	), to avoid dismissal o	f the appeal.					
AMENDMENTS	so med widim the time period set to	Man 111 07 01 10 41.07(1	- <i>/</i> ·					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);						
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	· <del></del>							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>			_					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		ill be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  3. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessare.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ls to provide a 1).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet			nce because:					
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	NICK CORSARO NICK CORSARINER	Alan T. Gantt						
PRIMANI								

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In revewing applicant's arguments and the Salonaho reference, the passage quoted by both the applicant and the examiner allows for a power control processing unit to adjust the power correction interval adaptively where the new value is communicated in the initiation message together with the new target power, thus meeting the first limitation. Also, there are provisions for the use of a timer in determining the commencement of the interval, and the use of timers are common when providing for perodic changes. Thus, the examiner feels that with the very limited language of applicant's independent claims and the passages of the Salonaho reference, there is not enough to distinguish applicant's invention of the independent claims from the Salonaho reference.